

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Christian et al. (EP Pat. No. 1 011 020). Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christian et al. (EP Pat. No. 1 011 020). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Although these rejections suggest that Christian et al. teaches a thermal transfer image-receiving sheet having a dye-receptive layer located on one side of a substrate, the rejections do not identify a specific disclosure in Christian et al. In view of the abstract and column [0013] at page 4, however, Christian et al. discloses is an imaging element including a support, an image-forming layer, a transparent magnetic recording layer and an electrically-conductive layer, superposed on said support. Thus, Christian et al. does not disclose or suggest "a dye-receptive layer" as recited in Claims 1 and 2. In addition, Christian et al. does not disclose or suggest "an easy adhesion layer", as recited in amended Claims 1 and 2. Moreover, Christian et al. does not disclose "the thermal transfer image-receiving sheet" as recited in these claims.

Furthermore, Christian et al. discloses the problem to be solved and an object of the invention to be improving conductive layers which can be used in a wide variety of imaging elements, especially photographic elements. See, e.g., page 4, lines 40 to 44.

Christian et al.'s invention is also directed to the utilization of silver halide photographic films according to the disclosure at page 4, lines 50 to 55. On the other hand, the present development recognized the technical problems associated with the offset of an antistatic agent, a transfer of an antistatic agent onto a carrier roll of a thermal printer, lowering in image characters of the thermal transfer image-receiving sheet and lowering in coating strength. See, e.g., the present specification at page 3, lines 24 to 31. Therefore, the inventors of the present development considered the prior art problem and found a means for solving the problem. Since Christian et al. clearly differs from the claimed invention in the technical field, the problem to be solved, the objective, the essential features and in the application of the invention, there is no motivation to modify Christian et al. to create Applicants' invention as recited in Claims 1 and 2.

The Applicant, thus, respectfully asserts that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to achieve the present inventions as recited in Claims 1 and 2 based on Christian et al. Since each of Claims 3 to 5 dependent from Claim 1 or 2, Applicants respectfully assert these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2006

By: _____


Michael E. Hilton
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/jlk